DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 946 RC 010 725

AUTHOR Lionberger, Herbert F.; Wong, Tso Sang
TITLE Performance of the Integration Function by Community Development Specialists in Missouri.
PUB DATE 9 Aug 78
NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Community Development; Educational Background; *Extension Agents; Human Resources; Information Services; *Integrated Activities; Interpersonal Competence; Organizational Communication; Organizational Effectiveness; *Performance Factors; Public Relations; Resource Staff Role; *Rural Extension; Specialists; University Extension
IDENTIFIERS *Missouri

ABSTRACT

The integration role of community development agents and the social system in which they work was examined. Their personal capability to act as an integrating agent was inferred from the nature of the specialized training prescribed in the community development master degree program and their prior occupational experience. Operational manifestations of integrating capability were inferred from the diversity of and intensity with which resources were used in specific projects and in the aggregate during the past year. System capability was examined in terms of the manner in which requests from the field were handled with reference to official prescription and informally through the interpersonal faculty network. Questionnaires were completed by 29 community development and government specialists during the summer of 1977. Additional interviews were conducted with the on-campus faculty centrally involved in making university services available to off-campus staff. Among the findings were that the community development specialists were more frequently involved with community, neighborhood and regional development projects; all but one had had one to five different kinds of jobs, mostly in public service, which increased their capability to identify and mobilize resources for client use; information sources and contacts included university on-campus faculty and local, state, and federal agencies; faculty contacts were mainly with extension appointed faculty, especially in the Department of Regional and Community Affairs and in the Agricultural Economics and Agronomy Departments. (NQ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Herbert F. Lionberger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED158948

RC 010725

PERFORMANCE OF THE INTEGRATION FUNCTION BY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS IN MISSOURI

Herbert F. Lionberger and Tso Sang Wong* Rev. 8/9/78

1. General Perspective and Rationale

This paper deals with the performance of the integration function by community development specialists** in the Missouri extension service. This in a general sense refers to the process by which adaptive changes are made in innovations that are introduced and the social settings into which they are introduced to meet intended user needs (Lionberger, 1977). In the community development context, it refers to both the process and condition of bringing together a diversity of resources - material, human, service and agency for use in a coordinated goal-directed activity. Operationally, the integration function can be examined in terms of the linking activities of C.D. specialists through which integration takes place. In this respect, it refers to both the process and condition of fitting new ideas, information or innovations into the user's social systems.

Although integrating-type activities are central to community development, it has never been explicitly described and analyzed either in textbooks or research literature. It seems to have never caught the attention of scholars of community development and become a topic of community development research. Despite early attention of anthropologists to integration issues (Linton, 1936), they are not alone in this neglect. Linking agents operating at the interface between innovating and user social systems have generally ignored them.

*On the staff of the Department of Rural Sociology of the University of Missouri, Columbia campus.

**Hereafter referred to as C.D. specialist.

Even in agriculture where research agencies have developed new information and technology, the inclination has been to believe and act as if the new innovations developed were ready for use after testing for local adaptability and utility has been completed. Too often this last step in transforming theory into practice has been omitted. The feeling has been that putting the new into use by the ultimate user is merely a matter of transferring the innovation from its point of origin to its point of use and plugging it in like an electrical appliance. This, of course, fails to recognize that innovations tend to change as they diffuse from one place to another mostly in the process of fitting them into the user's social system. For example, in agriculture the use of hybrid corn was initially regarded as merely a matter of taking one kind of seed out of the planter boxes and putting in another. Little attention was given to the fact that changes had to be made in a well worked out system of seed selection, care and storage in which farmers took great pride, that ideas about what constituted good quality seed and what good seed looked like had to be changed, that old cultural practices would not apply, that use and management of agricultural inputs had to be changed and much more finely tuned, that old ideas about grain quality suited for animal consumption would not fit, and that livestock feeding practices probably also had to be changed. Last, but not least, there was the status consideration of doing something that to neighbors made little sense. Other examples from agriculture where integration problems were especially difficult were the switch from square to round hay bales and from planting straight rows to planting planned crooked ones (contour farming and terracing). In the household, radar ranges and synthetic cloth must have introduced more than their share of integration problems. In community development it is a perennial problem.

In the final analysis adoption of an innovation cannot occur without the adaptive fitting in process, no matter how simple the practice may be. Integration viewed as a process, then, refers to the adaptations and changes that occur in establishing a satisfactory working arrangement within the user's social system to achieve the user's purpose which, incidentally, may be different from that intended by the developer. The completed task constitutes the condition of momentary integration. It is momentary because innovations are always in a process of change throughout the diffusion process, perhaps even to the point of hardly maintaining a recognizable identity (Coughnour 1968, Barnett 1953).

Although such helpful devices as "packages of practices" and extensive specification of everything that is required to fit a new innovation into a new social setting as in the developer-demonstrator program in education (Emrick 1977), the user is quite exclusively stuck with performing the integration function on his own. This is mainly because integration problems have been grossly **underestimated,** if indeed recognized at all. In general, as development in society takes place, differentiation of functions, activities, and services in society occur. Specialized agenices are developed to supply them through top-down channels that work in varying degrees of perfection and often quite independently of each other. This puts the individuals and adopting groups in a position of high interdependency but with little control over the systems to which they must relate and often depend to supply many things needed for doing what they want to do. To all of this must be added a steady stream of material and social inventions coming down the line and inter-dependencies within society all in a constant process of change. Collectively, this greatly intensifies the integration problem for potential users of innovations which have been occurring at an

ever increasing rate. In addition to normal management problems, potential adopters must be cognizant of and deal with government regulations, changing community and special interest group norms, and strategies for dealing with entities within the outside world upon which they must depend.

If this is difficult for the farmer, relatively free to make his own decisions, and where innovations ready to fit in are available, it is infinitely more difficult for groups - as adopting units - that must operate under even more constraints and must often draw upon a broader spectrum of resources in situations where often no tried and tested precedents exist for problems in need of solution and where innovations of a more complicated nature are at issue and for which little or no research for local adaptability has been done and for which relative advantages may be more in doubt. Ever accurate diagnosis of the problems may be lacking. Thus, the clients of community development specialists are additionally confronted with defining problems, exploring alternatives and perhaps generating new solutions through the process of group dynamics. The concern of this paper is with the integration role of community development agents and the social system in which they work.

II. The Research Design

Perhaps the most appropriate way to study the integrating process in community development would be to observe how inputs from outside social systems are actually incorporated into the receiving system to achieve specified goals. This would include observation of changes made in the intrinsic and extrinsic attributes of resources (innovations, ideas and practices introduced) and the adjustments made to incorporate them into the existing social system in accord with a blueprint for goal achievement. This would require indepth study over an extended

period of time. An alternative would be to rely on indicators of capability to perform the integration function. Of these, three appear to be suited to the study at hand.

First, there is the capability of the linking agent himself. Perhaps a generalist, who is acquainted with the range of resources that a client may need to use and who understands the diverse problems with which he must contend, is potentially a much better integrating agent than a specialist who knows a lot about one thing but lacks the capacity to relate to a variety of resources and conditions. Two ways in which this breadth may be acquired is through (1) broad academic exposure, preferably in an applied teaching setting and (2) broad prior occupational experiences.

Second, the specialist who draws upon multiple inputs and services to help clients achieve their objectives is potentially a better integrating agent than one who draws on a narrow range of resources and services.

Third, there are the support systems which facilitate the incorporation of resources at the local level and those that don't or do it less well. This can be done by providing suitable structures and facilitating the means by which inputs from the resource system (in this case, the university) are made available to clients.

A good example of a facilitating resource system are the Farmers Cooperatives in Taiwan. Here, at a local center within bicycle riding distance from home, a farmer can deposit his savings, get a loan, see the agricultural advisor, purchase needed agriculture supplies, rent equipment, and sell his farm produce all at one place. Inputs into the local cooperative come from a variety of sources, but the farmer can get them all at one location in consultation with resource people if and as needed. Another way for an integration function support system to evolve is through a network of relatively enduring interpersonal relationships through which client needs are met

quite aside from official prescription and structural arrangements. This is likely to work particularly well for informational and service needs.

System capability in regard to community development - with the university as the resource base - revolves about its ability to draw upon its diverse resources and channel outputs either directly to the client or via an intervening intermediary. The personal capability of the community development specialist to act as an integrating agent was examined and inferred from the nature of the specialized training prescribed in the community development master degree program and their prior occupational experience. Operational manifestations of integrating capability were inferred from the diversity of and intensity with which resources were used in specific projects and in the aggregate during the past year by the specialists involved in the study.

System capability was examined in terms of the manner in which requests from the field were handled with reference to official prescription and informally through the inter-personal faculty network. Data for the study was provided primarily by 29 community development and government specialists who completed questionnaires during the summer of 1977. This constituted 83 percent of those employed in the community development program of the university-wide extension service in the state of Missouri. Six of these were specialists in local government, the others in the broader field of community development. Since their general mode of operation is much the same, all were treated under the general designation of community development specialists.

Additional interviews were conducted with the on-campus faculty centrally involved in making university services available to the off-campus staff.

III. Results

The Community Development Specialist at Work

The clients of community development and government specialists are by and large local communities and groups with problems for which the University field representatives are asked to render assistance. Requests compared to those directed to other specialists are very diverse. This applies also to the information and resource base upon which they must draw to address them. An extensive integrating activity is accordingly necessary to bring resources and inputs to bear on the problems, sometimes initially not well defined and which in turn have to be resolved more by local innovation than by borrowing and fitting in previously validated innovations suited to solving the problems at issue.

Some idea of the diversity of problems with which specialists must contend can be surmised by the projects in which the community development specialists in this study had become involved. Each was asked to enumerate 10 important projects in which they had been involved during the past year. Those most frequently mentioned were community, neighborhood and regional development. They were frequently asked to help with youth programs, programs for the aged, and a diversity of projects concerned with occupational groups. They conducted seminars and training sessions on land use management, transportation, energy, coal gasification and public relations. They assisted with special programs for election officials, park board members, and law enforcement officers. They helped condut surveys, establish ambulance districts, recruit doctors, build swimming pools and implement plans for emergency medical service.

Activities most frequently mentioned were involvement in the action

itself. Others were educational and service related activities, planning and research (Table 1). Their mode of operation typically emphasized social interaction. This probably accounts for the idea exchange and feedback response by 8.3 percent of the specialists.

Of two hundred and ninety projects reported, more were initiated by local action (47.2 percent) than by C.D. specialists (25.9 percent) or even joint action between the two (5.5 percent) (Table 2). Thirty-nine percent of the projects had been completed and about half were still in process (49.7 percent). The status of the others was not known, was at a stand still or discontinued.

Performance of the Integration Function

Integration accomplished is the achievement of new working arrangements into which outside inputs have been incorporated and old one realigned to achieve a self-defined goals of the adopting unit. It is achieved mostly by the adopting unit which must also implement the blueprint for action. A through understanding of the process by which integration occurs would require indepth case studies into how outside inputs are incorporated into the existing social system and the way elements in the system are rearranged to accomodate the new. A prior assumption in this research is that change agents who are outside the user's social system can, and sometimes do, assist in chis integrating function.

The focus in this study is on operational indicators of the integrating agent role potential. These are manifest in the capability of specialists who perform this function, the linking manner in which they operate, and the capability of the specialist's social system to assist in this activity.

Integrating Capacity of the Specialists

Being trained as generalists and having generalist capabilities, C.D. and government specialists were in a very real sense integrating agents in their own right. They are required to take more and a greater diversity of courses than other subject matter specialists to obtain their masters degree program. A total of 48 hours is required compared to a usual 32. Courses are taught by faculty with advanced degrees in agricultural economics, political science, sociology, anthropology, social work and adult education. In addition each may elect to take 18 hours from general sociology, rural sociology, political science, economics, anthropology, recreation and park administration, higher and adult education and psychology.

Training is process oriented. Teaching is closely related to in-field operations. Most of the staff have alternated on-campus and in-field assignments and all continue to serve as resource persons for the field staff. Methodologically, interaction and people involvement are emphasized as the educational strategy to follow. Thus, both diversity of academic exposure and method of applying what is learned is conducive to performing the integrating function in social settings where a great diversity of resource inputs are needed. The C.D. specialists themselves have a greater built-in integrating capacity than the narrowly but well trained academic specialist.

Their integrating capability was further enhanced by broad occupational experience prior to their community development assignments. All but one had had one to five different kinds of jobs. Most were in public service which required extensive contact with the public. These included such things as public office, government service, social work, the ministry, extension work, grade and high school teaching, school administration, business and sales work. This diversity of prior experience surely had the potential of increasing specialists capability to identify and mobilize resources for client use.

Operational Indicators of the Integrating Function

Whereas agricultural specialists have a continuing supply of locally validated information and technology to bring to the attention of their clients and to deliver to them upon request, community development specialists and clients often have to jointly do their own innovating to solve the problems which they encounter. This often requires the use of many information sources and inputs from a variety of sources, perhaps first to define the problem and then to consider alternatives, prepare plans and to implement action. Locally tested and validated innovations to solve problems as in agriculture are generally not available. Operational indicators of the integrating role are the number and diversity of inputs upon which the specialists drew in carrying out their in-field responsibilities. For this, questionnaire data was utilized; namely, information sources and agency contact reported in carrying out important projects, about which each was questionned and the aggregate university resources and agency contacts reported in carrying out their work during the past year.

Evidence From Specific Projects. Enumeration of information sources and contacts made included those with the university on-campus faculty on the one hand and with local, state and federal agencies on the other. Contacts reported with on-campus faculty disclosed heavy use of them as a resource. Over 80 percent of the projects drew upon university academic departments with involvement more directed to other (34.5 percent) than to their own Regional and Community Affairs Department (19.5 percent) (TAble 3). However, joint involvement of own and other departments was indicated in 26.6 percent of the projects. The "other department" category involved 32 different departments in eleven divisions of the of the university and

faculty on both academic and extension appointments. Thus, from the standpoint of diversity of contacts alone, C.D. specialists were operating as high potential integrating agents in relation to the projects to which they rendered assistance.

A second kind of resource base upon which community development specialists drew heavily were local, state nad federal agencies of which state and local were most used. This combination was involved in 55.2 percent of the projects, while local, state and federal also were involved in 26.4 percent (Table 4). Very few involved only local (including regional) (5.8 percent) or state agencies alone (5.8 percent) and almost none federal agencies alone. Thus, the community development activity was heavily involved in bringing together state, local and federal agency inputs to solve local problems on behalf of local communities and groups. Completion and/or servicing the needs of most projects involved three or four kinds of agencies; very few involved only one (Table 5). Approximately 45 percent of the projects involved four to six agencies (Table 6) and somewhat over a

fourth informational resources and agencies to which local people have access (Table 7). Those most used were local government agencies and offices (28.0 percent) followed closely by university departments (25.4 percent). State offices or agencies were third with considerably less frequent mention. Thus, the projects sampled were carried out mainly as a team effort between the University as a resource system and local government offices and agencies.

Evidence from the Aggregate of Resources Upon Which Community Development Specialists Drew

The data base for this assessment was the number, kind and purpose of contacts that the C.D. field staff had (during the past year) with the on-campus faculty and other resource systems. The general situation was one of contacts with most divisions or colleges in the University and at least 33 of its 97 departments (Appendix Table 1). Faculty contacts made by the off-campus specialists were mainly with extension appointed faculty on the campus. As expected, contacts were concentrated most heavily in the Department of Regional and Community Affairs where extension appointments prevailed. Only about 5 percent of the total contacts were directed to faculty with academic appointments only.

Next, and quite numerous, were contacts made with the faculty in the College of Agriculture. In this college, inquiries were mainly to faculty in the Agricultural Economics and Agronomy departments. The divisions of next most frequent contacts were Engineering and Arts and Science. However, in both cases contacts were selectively made in a few departments.

The situation in regard to this operational indicator of the integration function was one of concerted use of own Department of Regional and Community Affairs where a variety of disciplinary expertise was available both directly

through consultation with the staff and indirectly through interdisciplinary materials prepared by the Department. Even so the faculty in the other divisions in the university were apparently called upon if and as needed.

The major purposes of contacts with on-campus faculty as indicated by the aggregated data were to get information (37.7 percent) and advice (20.1 percent). Idea exchange was third in order with chores performed fourth and again more on behalf of the field staff than the converse. Contacts with on campus faculty in own department (Regional and Community Affairs) compared to contacts with faculty in other departments was somewhat more interactive and for obtaining advice. This suggested deference to own kind of resource persons when hard decisions had to be made. Contacts with other departments were relatively more for getting information (Table 8).

Although the community development field staff most often initiated contacts with the on-campus faculty (51.0 percent), initiation was regarded as shared about equally by 37.2 percent indicating the interactive nature of this relationship. Almost all were initiated directly (Table 9). Interactive relationships with faculty in own on-campus department was much higher than with faculty in other departments and all were direct. But irrespective of the department involved, approximately 97.0 percent would recontact and almost 100 percent directly rather than through official channels (Table 10). When problems for which information was needed occurs, the inclination was for the in-field staff to go directly to the appropriate campus based faculty member. This was the response of 75.9 percent of the staff, another 6.9 percent were inclined to use a knowledgeable intermediary who would probably know whom to contact. A little over 10.0 percent were inclined to initially

use the University Referral Center to get the answers they needed (Table 11). This in an on-campus facility designed to receive questions from the field, make quick searches of on-campus and off-campus informational resources if necessary, and get answers relayed back quickly. There were only two specialists who indicated an inclination to route inquiries through official channels (Table 12).

Another resource upon which community development specialists could draw were other specialists stationed in own or adjoining counties within own district. All 21 districts had agricultural and youth specialists. Most had specialists in home economics. Eleven had business and industry specialists, and 18 had one or more in continuing education.

Although often stationed in adjoining counties, they have more opportunity for contact with each other than with specialists assigned to other areas. This being the case, the area organization provided an additional integrating facility for resource inputs. Some indication as to whether and the extent to which area resources were used is indicated by the contacts that community development specialists had with the other staff. All reported contacts with agricultural specialists, 14 in the 10 to 79 range and 9 with 120 or more contacts during the past year (Table 13). Likewise, all had contacts with youth specialists with a heavy concentration in the 20 or over range. Seven reported 80 or more. Contacts with the home economics staff tended to be bimodal, with some in the 10 to 79 range and others in the 120 or over range. Contacts were almost as frequent with both business and industry specialists and those in continuing education. This communicative exchange among the area staff was highly conducive to the performance of the integrating function in the information supply line from the university as a resource system to information users clienteles.

Other resources upon which community development specialists frequently drew were federal, state, and local agencies. All but one of the specialists had one or more contacts with federal agencies, mostly in the one to 40 range and most also with both the State Division of Community and Industrial Development and the State Division of Community Development. These contacts were heavily concentrated in the one to 20 range (Table 14).

The State Division of Community and Industrial Development is primarily concerned with getting industries into the state and the State Division of Community Development with a community recognition and reward program. In this the university field staff cooperate in a number of ways quite like help rendered to any community. Relations with the Department were cordial and mutually supportive.

Quite understandably, agency contacts were distinctly highest with county and local officals since this was where most project activity occured. The median number was 39. Those with local, civic and service groups followed in order with a frequency median of 27. Judging from the number and frequency of contacts reported, close liason was also maintained with regional planning units in the respective areas (Table 15).

Business and professional groups were resources with which frequent contacts were also made. In general, the high number and diversity of contacts made with agencies and resource bases enhanced the potential of C.D. specialists for performing the integrating function.

Evidence From How The System Operates At Center

The campus based community development staff operates as integrating agents, by (1) preparing technical and program materials of an interdisciplinary

nature and by (2) responding to requests that come from the field for which a diversity of academic inputs are often required. While responding to these requests the Community Development faculty remain continually alert to emerging problems for which special technical and program materials are prepared. These are used to bring the problem broader public attention and to assist those who want to do something about the problems. This may require interaction and writing by a variety of academicians over an extended period of time. Typical of this was the two year joint effort of faculty in eight academic departments to prepare technical information and program resource materials for addressing the recurrent problem of providing public services to people in the state. Other examples of emergent problems serviced with specialized materials were land use planning and rural development.

The second way in which the on-campus staff community development act as integrating agents is through servicing informational requests initiated directly by members of the public or more likely through local C.D. specialists who in turn relay requests to the campus staff. The primary basis for examining how and with what frequency such contacts were made was obtained from (12 of 22) on-campus support staff mentioned 5 or more times as resource persons who returned questionnaires concerning their servicing of incoming requests from the field.

Quite in contrast to incoming requests from the field staff heavily directed to the College of Public and Community Services and more particularly the Department of Regional and Community Affairs on campus referrals were heavily directed to the staff in other divisions and departments, in fact, all divisions but the School of Nursing and to 60 percent of the 97 departments.

In addition to departmental contacts, estimates of the number of contacts during the past year were made. Almost a third of these aggregated contacts (32.2%) were with the College of Agriculture to head the list. The College of Public and Community Services was second with 30.1 percent and the Arts and Sciences College third with 18 percent. The rest were directed to all other divisions in the Columbia campus of the University of Missouri except the School of Nursing. The highly significant feature about the on-campus referral pattern from the socio-metric stars was that almost 70 percent of the servicing requests went to divisions other than the College of Public and Community Services. The comparable dispersal rate of referrals from the Department of Regional and Community Affairs to other departments in the university was nearly 90 percent. With high concentration of incoming (from the field) requests to the Department of Regional and Community Affairs and the dispersed referral to other departments and divisions within the university system, the integrating-link function of the Department is clearly indicated.

Much the same picture was projected by mentions made by the socio-metric stars of the faculty that they named as most frequently contacted for servicing assistance. Thirteen out of the 63 high use referents

named were in the Department of Regional and Community Affairs. The other 50 were located in other departments. Mentions for the Departments of Agricultural Economics, Political Science, Agronomy, and Rural Sociology were in the four to six range. Eighteen additional departments were named one to four times.

The purpose for which contacts were most frequently made varied considerably. Requests for information (26.2%) and advice (21.4%) were first and second most frequent. Requests for needed materials also figured strongly; 16.9 percent generally wanted specially prepared material for specific problem issues and 4.5 percent already prepared materials. Somewhat over 18 percent indicated idea exchange as a main reason. Finally, about 13 percent of the referred requests were for in-field help on behalf of clients.

Informational servicing outreach from the socio-metric stars extended beyond the local setting. Well over half (58.3%) indicated they had requested help from faculty on other campuses in the state. These included the University of Missouri at Rolla, and St. Louis, the southwestern and northwestern state universities, also, Washington, Lincoln and St. Louis universities and Stephens College. Three out of four made requests to federal government agencies and all but one to state agencies of which 18 were mentioned.

Thus, it was that the community development outreach system served as a mechanism for delivering science based information to clients in a local interactive problem solving framework in which virtually all divisions of the Columbia campus of the University of Missouri and eight other colleges and universities in the state contributed. These were articulated with numerous in coming field requests disproportionately channeled through the Department of Regional and Community Affairs to

other divisions and departments in the University.

IV. Conclusion and Observations

By virtue of (1) the training provided for community development specialists, (2) their diverse prior occupational experience, (3) the frequency with which they contacted the on-campus faculty for the information and services they needed, (4) the diversity of these contacts and their interactional nature, (5) the manner in which incoming informational service related contacts were fielded by the on-campus staff, (6) the way the university system operated to service in-field faculty needs, and (7) the diversity of agency and other resource inputs that were actually brought to bear on specific community development projects indicated that the C.D. specialists operated as input integrating agents.

The high concentration of contacts within the Department of Regional and Community Affairs and to extension appointed persons within the university system could be indicative either of (1) a relatively closed system and thus one unable or unwilling to draw upon other university informational resources that might be used to service in-field informational needs or (2) a high capability of the extension system and its representatives to respond to the incoming requests and questions from the field. The extent to which the community development specialists in the field drew upon other departments in the university and other resources outside of the university resource system, is indicative of the latter. Furthermore, by far the largest part of the informational servicing needs was supplied by persons who had extension appointments. However, there was nothing to indicate that if and when services beyond the official extension capability were needed, these would not be available either by direct contact with the faculty or more likely via an extension appointed

faculty member serving as an intermediary. All of this was quite aside from the interdisciplinary materials prepared by the Department for servicing the emergent and on going informational needs for problem issues in the state. For this, inputs from more than one academic department was ordinarily needed.

The integrating capacity of the university extension system, was further exemplified by the manner in which interpersonal networks operated to supply the informational and advisement needs of off-campus information users. Referrals of requests by the faculty contacted 5 or more times by the field staff were heavily to divisions in the university other than the College of Public and Community Services officially central to the community development outreach activity. Although referrals were highly concentrated on the Columbia campus, they were also directed to eight other universities in the state and to government agencies. The net effect of the interpersonal communicative network was to service outstate informational needs by drawing on a great diversity of resources, an activity central to the integration function.

From a utilitarian perspective the community development social system provided an interface mechanism between the diverse on-campus informational resource base and users that brought necessary multiple information sources to bear on complex local problems. It is hard to see how this could be done in the absence of complex interpersonal referral network which constitutes the working part of the community development social system.

TABLE 1. PROJECTS REPORTED BY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS CLASSIFIED BY ACTIVITIES INVOLVED

Activities	Number of Projects	%
Total	290	100.0
Educational	58	20.0
Service	50	17.2
Research	33	11.4
Action	68	23.5
Idea exchange + feedback	24	8.3
Planning	39	13.4
Not certain	18	6.2

TABLE 2. HOW PROJECTS UNDERTAKEN BY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS WERE INITIATED

Initiation Source	Number of Projects	%
Total	290	100.0
Extension only	75	25.9
Local only	137	47.2
Extension & local	16	5.5
Extension & external	0	0
Other combination	18	6.2
Other agencies	20	6.9
Already in process	8	2.8
Not certain	16	5.5

Table 3. UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Pattern of involvement	Number of Projects	%
Total	87	100.0
Department of Regional and Community Affairs only	17	19.5
Other departments only	30	34.5
Both	23	26.5
No university departments involved	17	19.5

TABLE 4. OPERATIONAL LOCALE OF AGENCIES INVOLVED IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Locale of Agency	Number of Projects	%
Total	87	100.0
Local & regional only	5	5.8
State only	5	5.8
Federal only	1	1.1
Local & state	48	55.2
Local & federal	4	4.6
State & federal	1	1.1
Local & state & federal	23	26.4

TABLE 5. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY THE KINDS OF AGENCIES INVOLVED IN IMPLEMENTING THEM

Number of Kinds	Number of Projects	%
Total	87	100.0
1	6	6.9
2	16	18.4
3	23	26.4
4	19	21.8
5	8	9.2
6	11	12.7
7-9	4	4.6

TABLE 6. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS CLASSIFIED BY THE NUMBER OF AGENCIES INVOLVED IN IMPLEMENTING THEM

Number of Agencies Involved	Number of Projects	%
Total	87	100.0
1-3	21	24.1
4-6	39	44.8
7-9	14	16.1
10-12	6	6.9
13 or over	7	8.1

TABLE 7. UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES MENTIONED AS USED IN THE 87 PROJECTS REPORTED BY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS

Kind of Agency	Number Mentioning	%
University departments		
Department of Regional and Community Affairs	46	8.9
All others	85	16.5
Local schools & colleges	18	3.5
Churches	6	1.2
Civil groups	45	8.7
Local government agencies and offices	144	28.0
Social service agencies	7	1.4
Business representatives or agencies	29	5.6
Professionals & professional associations	12	2.3
Farm organizations	3	.6
State departments or agencies	62	12.0
Federal offices or agencies	41	8.0
Hospitals & health agencies	11	2.1
Others	6	1.2

TABLE 8. PERCENT OF CONTACT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS WITH ON - CAMPUS FACULTY CLASSIFIED BY PURPOSES OF CONTACT AND DEPARTMENT IN WHICH LOCATED*

Department	Total	Purposes of Contacts					
		Get information (%)	Get Advice (%)	Do a Chore For Them (%)	Do a Chore For Me (%)	Exchange Idea (%)	Other (%)
Total	100 (n=268)**	37.7	20.1	10.5	14.5	16.4	0.8
Department of Regional and Community Affairs	100 (n= 91)	34.1	24.2	13.2	9.8	17.6	1.1
All others	100 (n=177)	39.6	18.1	9.0	16.9	15.8	0.6

* Based on response of first 10 faculty members listed about whom more detailed questions were asked.

** Here and subsequently includes five local government specialists.

TABLE 9. PERCENT OF CONTACTS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS WITH ON-CAMPUS FACULTY CLASSIFIED BY WHOM AND THE MANNER IN WHICH CONTACTS WERE USUALLY INITIATED

Department to which directed	Total	Who Usually Initiates Contacts					
		They	Self			Both	Not Certain
			Total	Through official channels	Direct		
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Total	100	5.2	51.0	(3.1)	(47.9)	37.2	6.6
Department of Regional and Community Affairs	100	4.8	32.1	(0.0)	(32.1)	63.1	0.0
All others	100	5.9	62.4	(4.3)	(58.1)	29.0	2.7

TABLE 10. PERCENT OF ON-CAMPUS FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY CONTACTED BY INFIELD STAFF CLASSIFIED BY WHETHER THEY WOULD RECONTACT ON-CAMPUS STAFF OR NOT AND HOW*

Department	Total	Whether Would Recontact or Not			
		Yes		No or Probably Not	Not certain
		Directly	Via State Official		
Total	100 (n=268)	96.6	0.4	1.5	1.1
Department of Regional and Community Affairs	100 (n= 91)	96.7	1.1	1.1	1.1
All others	100 (n=177)	96.6	0.0	1.7	1.7

* Confined to first 10 faculty listed.

TABLE 11. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS CLASSIFIED BY WHERE THEY ARE INCLINED TO GO FIRST WHEN THEY ENCOUNTER A QUESTION THEY CAN'T ANSWER

Person	Number of CD Specialists	Percent
Total	29	100.0
Area director	1	3.4
Direct to subject matter specialists	22	75.9
Indirectly to appropriate subject matter specialists	0	0.0
A trusted knowledgeable who may tell you when you can get an answer	2	6.9
University referral center	3	10.4
Others	1	3.4

TABLE 12. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS CLASSIFIED BY THE MANNER IN WHICH THEY ORDINARILY CONTACT ON-CAMPUS FACULTY TO THE INFORMATION THEY DESIRE

Manner in Which Contact is Ordinarily Made	Number of CD Specialists	Percent
Total	29	100.0
Through official channels	2	6.9
Directly to knowledgeable source	27	93.1

Table 13. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS CLASSIFIED BY NUMBER OF CONTACTS THEY HAD WITH OTHER SUBJECT MATTER SPECIALISTS IN OWN AREA DURING THE PAST YEAR

Kind of Subject Matter Specialists in Own Area	Total	Number of Contacts							
		None	Not Certain	1-9	10-19	20-39	40-79	80-119	120 & Over
Agricultural	29	0	4	2	7	2	5	0	9
Home Economics	29	1	5	4	3	0	8	0	8
Business & Industry	29	1	7	6	5	5	4	0	1
Continuing Education	29	2	5	2	5	3	3	1	8
Youth	29	0	2	2	6	5	7	2	5

Table 14. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS CLASSIFIED BY NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

State and Federal Agencies	Total	Number of Contacts				
		None	Not Certain	1-19	20-39	40 & Over
State Division of Community and Industrial Development	29	7	7	15	0	0
State Division of Community Development	29	4	7	16	2	0
Federal agencies	29	1	4	13	5	4

Table 15. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND GOVERNMENT SPECIALISTS CLASSIFIED BY NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH PROFESSIONAL, REGIONAL PLANNING AND LOCAL AGENCIES

Kind of Agency	Total	Number of Contacts							
		None	Not Certain	1-19	20-39	40-79	80-119	120 & Over	Median
Planning									
Regional planning	29	0	1	13	5	3	1	1	16
Extension council	29	0	2	24	1	2	0	0	14
Business	29	2	2	9	4	7	0	5	32
Professional	29	5	3	18	3	0	0	0	5.6
Local									
County court	29	1	2	10	7	7	0	2	26.6
County and local agency officials	29	0	3	5	8	9	0	4	39
Civil and/or service groups	29	2	2	10	4	7	0	3	27
other	29	0	26	0	0	2	0	1	0

APPENDIX

TABLE 1. NUMBER OF ON-CAMPUS FACULTY CONTACTED BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FIELD STAFF CLASSIFIED BY THEIR DIVISIONAL - DEPARTMENTAL LOCATION ON THE COLUMBIA CAMPUS

College or Division and Department	Number of On-campus Faculty Mentioned	Number of Times On-campus Faculty Were Mentioned				
		1-4	5-9	10-19	20 & over	Number unknown
GRAND TOTAL*	114	97	48	44	27	172
COLLEGE OF PUBLIC & COMMUNITY SERVICES	26	41	30	31	18	73
Regional & Community Affairs	15	25	26	24	17	44
Recreation & Park Administration	4	7	4	5	1	13
Public Safety	5	7	0	0	0	12
Social Work	2	2	0	2	0	4
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE	39	22	7	7	2	51
Agricultural Economics	7	10	5	2	1	15
Agronomy	5	2	0	2	0	7
(Extension Information)	9	1	0	0	0	9
Rural Sociology	5	4	1	3	1	9
Agricultural Engineering	5	2	1	0	0	4
Agricultural Education	3	0	0	0	0	3
Plant Pathology	1	0	0	0	0	1
Poultry Husbandry	1	1	0	0	0	0
Horticulture	1	1	0	0	0	0
Entomology	1	1	0	0	0	0
School of Forestry, Fisheries and Wild Life	1	0	0	0	0	3
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING	3	2	1	1	0	3
(Engineering Extension)	2	1	1	1	0	1
Mechanical Engineering	1	1	0	0	0	2

*The contacts reported involved 11 of the 13 divisions and 33 of the 97 departments in the Columbia Campus of Missouri University.

TABLE 1 cont. NUMBER OF ON-CAMPUS FACULTY CONTACTED BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FIELD STAFF CLASSIFIED BY THEIR DIVISIONAL-DEPARTMENTAL LOCATION ON THE COLUMBIA CAMPUS

College or Division and Department	Number of On-campus Faculty Mentioned	Number of Times On-campus Faculty Were Mentioned				
		1-4	5-9	10-19	20 & over	Number unknown
COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS	5	0	1	0	0	3
Housing and Interior Design	2	0	1	0	0	1
Family Economics & Management	1	0	0	0	0	1
Child & Family Development	1	0	0	0	0	1
Human Nutrition, Foods and Food System Management	1	0	0	0	0	0
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE	6	15	6	3	5	13
Political Science	4	15	6	3	5	11
Economics	1	0	0	0	0	1
Geology	1	0	0	0	0	1
SCHOOL OF LAW	2	0	0	0	1	1
SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATIONAL SCIENCE	2	1	0	0	0	1
Information Science	1	1	0	0	0	0
Library Science	1	0	0	0	0	1
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS & PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	2	2	0	0	0	0
Institute of Public Administration	1	1	0	0	0	0
Finance	1	1	0	0	0	0
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION	2	0	0	0	0	4
Higher & Adult Education	2	0	0	0	0	4

TABLE 1 cont. NUMBER OF ON-CAMPUS FACULTY CONTACTED BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FIELD STAFF CLASSIFIED BY THEIR DIVISIONAL-DEPARTMENTAL LOCATION ON THE COLUMBIA CAMPUS

College or Division and Department	Number of On-campus Faculty Mentioned	Number of Times On-campus Faculty Were Mentioned				
		1-4	5-9	10-19	20 & over	Number unknown
SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM	1	0	0	0	0	1
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE	2	0	0	0	0	2
Family & Child Medicine	1	0	0	0	0	1
Child Health	1	0	0	0	0	1
(EXTENSION ADMINISTRATION STAFF)	22	13	3	1	1	19
(TECHNICAL REFERRAL CENTER)	1	1	0	1	0	0
(INDUSTRIAL REFERRAL CENTER)	1	0	0	0	0	1

References

Barnett, Homer G.
1953 Innovation: The Basis of Cultural Change. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Coughenour, C. Milton
1968 "Some general problems in diffusion: from the perspective of the theory of social action." Pp. 5-21. North Central Regional Research Bulletin 186, Diffusion Research Needs, University of Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station.

Emricle, John A.
1977 Evaluation of the National Diffusion Network, Volume I: Findings and Recommendations. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute.

Linton, Ralph
1936 The Study of Man. New York: Appleton - Century - Crofts.

Lionberger, Herbert F.
1977 "Developing and disseminating information for modernizing societies: toward an ideal systems model. Paper prepared for a joint student-faculty seminar sponsored by the center for International Programs and Studies, Columbia, Missouri.